GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

Public Servants - Revenue (Endowment) Department - Allegations of acquisition of assets disproportionate to the known sources of legal income against Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer (Retd.), Kalyanakatta Complex, T.T.D. Tirumala, Tirupati District - Departmental Proceedings instituted under Rule 20 of A.P.C.S (CC&A) Rules, 1991 r/w Rule 9 of A.P.R.P Rules, 1980 - Exonerated from the Charges – Further action dropped - Regularize the suspension period - Orders -Issued.

==========

REVENUE (VIGILANCE.VII) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No.199 Dated: 07.03.2025.

Read the following:

1.From DG, ACB, A.P., Vijayawada, final report in Lr.Rc.No.115/RCATCT/2016, dt.09.08.2018.
2. G.O.Ms.No.102, REVENUE (VIG.IV) Dept, dated: 06.02.2018.
3. G.O.Rt.No.199, REVENUE (VIG.IV) Dept, dated: 06.02.2019.
4. Written statement of defense dt.25.03.2019 of Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer (Retd.), Kalyanakatta Complex, T.T.D. Tirumala, Tirupati District.
5. G.O.Rt.No.612, REVENUE (VIG.IV) Dept, dated: 31.07.2020.
6. G.O.Rt.No.903, REVENUE (VIG.IV) Dept, dated: 23.11.2020.
7. G.O.Rt.No.519, Revenue (VIG.VII) Dept, dated: 29.05.2023.
8. Inquiry report dt.08.11.2023 of the Inquiry Officer received through the E.O, TTD, Lr.RoC.No.DA4/9966/2026, Dt.11.12.2023.
9. Govt. Memo.No. 376860/Vig.IV.1/2016, REV (VIG.IV) Dept, Dt.31.01.2024.
10.Explanation dt.05.02.2024 of Sri BangarupalemThangavelu, Tonsurer (Retd.), Kalyanakatta Complex, T.T.D., Tirumala.
11. Govt. Memo.No. 376860/Vig.IV.1/2016, REV (VIG.IV) Dept, Dt.18.04.2024.
12. Explanation dt.29.04.2024 of Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer (Retd.), Kalyanakatta Complex, T.T.D., Tirumala.

ORDER:

Whereas, it has come to the notice of the Government that the Anti Corruption Bureau authorities registered a disproportionate assets case against Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer Maistry, Kalyanakatta Complex, TTD, on 30.08.2016, alleging that he had acquired disproportionate assets amounting to Rs.2,17,48,000/-. He was placed under suspension and later reinstated into service. He retired on 30.08.2018 upon attaining the age of superannuation. In the reference 1st read above, the Director General, Anti Corruption Bureau, submitted the final report, recommending prosecution under Section 13(2) r/w Section 13(1) (e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, and initiation of departmental action for a major penalty under APRP Rules, 1980. Since the officer had already retired, prosecution sanction from the Government was not required, and the Anti Corruption Bureau, was to file a charge sheet in the competent court.

2. And whereas, after examining the final report of the Director General, Anti Corruption Bureau, the Government, under the Vigilance Commission's scheme, accepted the recommendations and, in the references 2nd and 3rd read above, initiated departmental proceedings by framing charges against the officer for violations of conduct rules.

3. And whereas, in the reference 4th read above, the charged officer submitted his written defense denying the charges. Since the explanation was unconvincing, Sri K.Nagaraju, Dy.EO, TTD, was appointed as the Inquiry Officer in the reference 5th read above. Subsequently, upon request from the Executive Officer, TTD, the Government replaced him with Smt. K. Parvathi, Special Grade Deputy Executive Officer, Sri Kodanda Rama Swamy Temple, Tirupati in the reference 6th read above. Sri N. Eshwar, Inspector of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, Tirupati Range, was appointed as the Presenting Officer in the reference 7th read above.

4. And whereas, in the reference 8th read above, the Inquiry Officer submitted her report, stating that the allegations in Articles of Charges I, II, and III were all proved. After examining the report under the Vigilance Commission's scheme, the Government accepted the findings and sought further explanation from the charged officer in the reference 9th read above.

5. And whereas, in the reference 10th read above, the charged officer, in his response, emphasized that he had been working as a tonsurer since childhood due to the hereditary nature of his profession. He claimed he was unaware of the rules requiring permission for property transactions and lending money. He further stated that he had only submitted property statements from 2016 onwards after his promotion to Tonsurer Maistry.

6. And whereas, in the reference 11th read above, a show cause notice was issued to the charged officer regarding the proposed penalty of withholding three percent (3%) of his pension for a period of three (3) months. In response, Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer, Kalyanakatta Complex, TTD, Tirumala, Tirupati District, submitted his explanation, stating that the proposed penalty was unjustified. He argued that his appeal was not heard satisfactorily by the Enquiry Officer and was subject to delays, causing him significant mental and physical distress over nearly five years. He further stated that both he and his spouse have been suffering from health issues for the past eight years, leading to substantial medical expenses. Additionally, he mentioned that his entire family has been facing financial difficulties due to the non-receipt of his pension since 30.06.2018 and requested that further action against him be dropped in the reference 12th read above.

7. After careful examination, the Government observed that natural justice demands a fair and judicious approach when assessing a disproportionate assets case. Given that the officer was a hereditary tonsurer, the question arose as to whether he had any real opportunity to accumulate illicit wealth. Furthermore, the TTD administration failed to properly orient these mirasi tonsurers on service rules, resulting in their lack of awareness of such requirements. Since the officer was never informed or warned about the obligation to file property statements, holding him accountable for this lapse was deemed unjust. Initially, the Government proposed withholding 3% of the officer's pension for three months. However, in response, the officer cited significant hardships, including prolonged legal battles, financial strain, and health issues affecting his family. Upon further review, the Government found that the case against the officer lacked merit. A tonsurer's income primarily comes from voluntary tips, which do not constitute bribery or misuse of position. The officer's lack of awareness of service rules was a consequence of the administration's failure rather than any deliberate misconduct on his part. The prolonged legal proceedings had already caused considerable distress to the officer and his family. Considering these factors, and given that the individual is already facing prosecution in a court of law, the Government has decided to exonerate Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer, Kalyanakatta Complex, TTD, Tirumala, Tirupati District (Retd.), from all charges and to drop further action in this matter.

8. Accordingly, the Government hereby exonerates Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer, Kalyanakatta Complex, TTD, Tirumala, Tirupati District (Retd.), from all charges and dropped further action against him. The Government also hereby orders that the suspension period undergone by Sri Bangarupalem Thangavelu, Tonsurer, Kalyanakatta Complex, TTD, Tirumala, Tirupati District (Retd.), be treated as 'On Duty' under FR 54-B(3).

9. The Executive Officer, TTD, Tirupati, shall take the necessary further action accordingly.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

V.VINAY CHAND
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To
Sri BangarupalemThangavelu, Tonsurer, Kalyanakatta Complex, TTD, Tirumala, Tirupati District (through the E.O, TTD, Tirupati).
The Executive Officer, TTD, Tirupati.
Copy to:
The D.G., Anti Corruption Bureau, Vijayawada.
The Secretary to Commissioner, A.P.V.C., Velagapudi.
The PS to Hon'ble Minister for Endowment.
SF/SC.

// FORWARDED::BY ORDER //

SECTION OFFICER